

|   |                        |                     |  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|   | 10/510,066             | LINDSLEY ET AL.     |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|   | Emily Bernhardt        | 1624                |  |

**All Participants:**

(1) Emily Bernhardt.

(2) Mr. Leff.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 19 July 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*24 and claims 6-7*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner left a message for Mr. Leff regarding the After final claims. Typos are noted in claim 6 and 7. See "metanamine" vs. "methanamine" See 2nd species of 6 and 7. Also new claim 24 is not entirely described in earliest US prov case and thus Barnett would still be applicable. Note the last 4 choices for "Q" in claim 24 are not described in said priority case. On 7/19/07 Mr. Leff left a message authorizing the typos be corrected as well as the removal of last 4 choices for Q. As indicated in an earlier conversation with Mr. Leff if the case is otherwise in condition for allowance, the provisional obvious double patenting rejection will be withdrawn..